



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/681,751	05/31/2001	James Norman Cawse	RD-27832	6425
6147	7590 11/30/2004		EXAMINER	
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY GLOBAL RESEARCH			MARSCHEL, ARDIN H	
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59 NISKAYUNA, NY 12309		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1631	
			DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/681,751	CAWSE, JAMES NORMAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Ardin Marschel	1631				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timely. I the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/18/	/04 and 9/14/04.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-46 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) 38-42, 44, and 45 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-22,24-37,43 and 46 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplished any accomplished any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D. 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed 6/18/04 and 9/14/04, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

NEW MATTER

Claims 1-22, 24-36, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The NEW MATTER rejection directed to the NEW MATTER of "randomly selected..." conditions is reiterated from the previous office action, mailed 6/10/04, and as necessitated by amendment regarding new added claim 46. In REMARKS, filed 6/18/04, applicant argues that paragraphs 29-32 and Table 4 provide written basis for said "random selected..." conditions. Consideration of said paragraphs 29-32 firstly has failed to reveal any random selection disclosure whatsoever. Consideration of Table 4 reveals that a point in a gradient is selected at random which fails to support either conditions (plural) selected at random as in instant claim 1 nor the random selection from a population as also cited in claim 1. Thus, the Table 4 random selection clearly

Art Unit: 1631

lacks any correspondence or written support for said NEW MATTER which is therefore still properly deemed NEW MATTER.

PRIOR ART

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 37 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eustace et al. [Chemical Innovation, 31(4): 31 (2001)].

This rejection is reiterated from the previous office action, mailed 6/10/04. In REMARKS, filed 6/18/04, applicant argues that the reference does not suggest how to apply the Six Sigma methodology to a myriad of other industrial settings, let alone the many aspects of combinatorial experiment program or for improving reagent delivery or a stock formulating step therein. In response, instant claims 37 and 43 lack any improvement limitations but rather only result in a calculation of defects per unit of reactant delivery or formulating step. Such defect calculating of reactant or incoming (formulating) material was pointed to in the reference and not argued by applicant. Also, the combining of incoming material of the reference is combinatorial since no distinguishing definition has been pointed to by applicant nor seen in the instant disclosure as filed. Therefore, applicant's argument is not directed to the basis of the rejection and therefore moot.

Art Unit: 1631

Claims 38-42, 44, and 45 are allowable.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 1631

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 26, 2004

Ardin II Marsh 11/26/04 ARDIN H. MARSCHEL PRIMARY EXAMINER